UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,703	08/08/2006	Jean Dijon	294550US0PCT	2430
	7590 12/08/201 AK, MCCLELLAND 1	EXAMINER		
1940 DUKE STREET			PADGETT, MARIANNE L	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1715	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/08/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/588,703	DIJON ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
	I	

	MARIANNE L. PADGETT	1715	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>18 November 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS		=	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelication (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) \boxtimes The period for reply expires $\underline{5}$ months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(1)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ').	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	n. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	201100
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, k (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belowed)	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	ΓE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		oted cidims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	. ,,	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		(, .
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all _ non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	•	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,4-9,13-17 and 21-25</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>3,10,12,18 and 20</u> AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	<u>.</u>		
8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu	t before or on the date of filing a No	ntice of Anneal will not	he entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	I sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10.	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	, , , , ,	condition for allowan	ce because:
12.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Marianne L. Padgett/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1715	

Continuation of 3. NOTE:

The proposed amendments introduced new issues by changing the scope of the independent claims, including by requiring the substrate surface to have the claimed surface tension relationship instead of just some material that may be only part of the substrate, with temporal context that was not previously present. Propose claim language is also requiring the formation of the layer of catalytic material to proceed by a sequences of deposits with a choice of performing waiting periods between the deposits either under vacuum or "a controlled atmosphere", which deposition process was not previously required. Also changes in dependent claim such as claim 6 changing the scope of catalytic material to particular metals of nickel, iron or cobalt as opposed to generic medals or generic semiconductors is also a change in scope presenting new issues. All this new issues need careful review for support in the original specification.

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):

Many 112 first & second clarity & support issues appear to be corrected by the proposed amendment.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Previously applied art which includes employing ALD processing needs to be further reviewed in light of proposed claim amendments & their meaning in light of the specification, plus further search in view of new issues may also be required due to new specific requirements.